UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/733,276 | 12/12/2003 | Han Choon Lee | 040044-0307078 | 8236 |

909 7590 07/13/2004

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| NGUYEN, THANH T | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2813 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/733,276 | LEE, HAN CHOON | |
| | Examin r | Art Unit | |
| | Thanh T. Nguyen | 2813 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspond nce address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

In view of the request filed on 6/14/04, the office action is followed:

### *Priority*

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d).

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on 12/12/03 has been considered.

### *Oath/Declaration*

Oath/Declaration filed on 12/12/03 has been considered.

### *Specification*

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 8, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,303).

Referring to figures 1-4, Lin teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising:

Forming a first insulating layer (38) on a semiconductor substrate (10);

Forming a barrier layer (54), forming a copper seed (see col. 4, lines 23-34) first conductive line (56) by depositing a conductive material on the first insulating layer and selectively pattern the conductive material (see figure 3);

Forming a second insulating layer (70/72) by depositing an insulating material on top of the substrate (10) including on the first conductive line (56);

Forming a via hole (76) and a trench (74) by selectively patterning the second in order to expose a certain portion of the first conductive line (56, see figure 3); and

Removing a natural oxide layer (CuO, see col. 3, lines 48-67, col. 4, lines 1-10), formed on the first conductive line (56) through natural oxidation of the first conductive line, by heat treating in an $H_2$+CO gas atmosphere (see col. 3, lines 57-67, claim 3).

Regarding to claim 13, repeating the step (see col. 4, lines 34-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,303) as applied to claims 4, 8, 13 above in view of Hasunuma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,090,701).

Referring to figures 1-4, Lin teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising:

Forming a first insulating layer (38) on a semiconductor substrate (10);

Forming a barrier layer (54), forming a copper seed (see col. 4, lines 23-34) first conductive line (copper, 56, meeting claims 2, 11) by depositing a conductive material on the first insulating layer and selectively pattern the conductive material (see figure 3);

Forming a second insulating layer (70/72) by depositing an insulating material on top of the substrate (10) including on the first conductive line (56);

Forming a via hole (76) and a trench (74) by selectively patterning the second in order to expose a certain portion of the first conductive line (56, see figure 3); and

Removing a natural oxide layer (CuO, see col. 3, lines 48-67, col. 4, lines 1-10), formed on the first conductive line (56) through natural oxidation of the first conductive line, by heat treating in an $H_2$+CO gas atmosphere (see col. 3, lines 57-67, claim 3).

Regarding to claim 13, repeating the step (see col. 4, lines 34-38).

However, the reference does not teach removing the natural oxide by plasma-processing the natural oxide layer using $H_2$+CO gas, and the temperature range.

Referring to figures, Husunuma et al. teaches removing the natural oxide by using heat treatments or plasma treatment in $H_2$ +CO gas (col. 9, lines 54-67, meeting claims 1, 6, 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time of the invention was made would removing the natural oxide by using plasma treatment in $H_2$ +CO gas in process of Lin as taught by Hasunuma et al. because removing the natural oxide by using plasma treatment in $H_2$ +CO gas would accelerate the reaction by exerting a bias on the substrate (see col. 11, lines 52-65).

The temperature range of claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 are considered to involve routine optimization while has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in In re Aller, the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

> "Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art...such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."
> *In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).*

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any temperature range suitable to the method in process of Lin in order to optimize the process.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1695, or by Email via address Thanh.Nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956 (**See MPEP 203.08**).

Thanh Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Patent Examining Group 2800

TTN